

PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-N

PC-N1

From: Neal, Patricia O [Patricia.Neal@va.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 08, 2013 8:46 AM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

Importance: High

Absolutely not. Not only is this project not wanted or needed, but the project will also displace the coyotes AGAIN, and cause them to venture into the local neighborhoods for food putting residents (especially children) at risk. } 1

What is wrong with you people? THINK!

PC-N2

From: JANE NETHERS [4nethers@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 8:54 PM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: No toll road

Richard and I are opposed to 405 -605 toll road. } 1
Thanks, Jane Nethers

PC-N3

From: HUNG NGUYEN [snguyhun@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 9:35 PM
To: cbyrne@OCTA.net; Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: 405 Expansin Project

I am opposing a braided on/off ramp on the 405 Northbound side since this will impact our life. } 1

Hung Nguyen
9054 Wendy Cir
Fountain Valley, CA 92708
714-809-4153

PC-N4

From: lc_env@yahoo.com
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 12:04 AM
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

Dear Sir or Madam,
We living on Daisy Avenue in Fountain Valley are greatly concerned about this new project and its affect on our neighborhood. We are living with a constant noise of sirens and officers pulling people over in late evening and very early morning hours already. Even through double paned windows and doors, we can hear traffic. We do not need more traffic and more noise. Not to mention the air pollution with more cars around and we also have a concern for our privacy. } 1

Therefore, we are opposed to this expansion project. Please reconsider and cease this plan.

Thank you.

Mrs. Nguyen

Sent from my iPad

PC-N5

From: Christine Nichols [christine.m.nichols@ca.rr.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 11:56 AM
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS
Subject: Feedback

I do not support either of the alternatives suggested. It has been agreed upon to add one general use lane in both directions; I support this. I do not support adding ANY version of toll lanes or the 3 person carpool lane, or truncating any of the freeway near Valley View.

1. I am against toll lanes - if the money is not currently available to add the lanes, they should not be built. California has been under severe budget cuts:

- implemented furlough days for service workers such as at the DMV and some of the court houses
- implemented furlough days for teachers
- is reducing fire fighters and law enforcement
- released prisoners early from state prisons

Again, the State does not have the money - taking on an unpaid endeavor to place the citizens and the state in further debt is irresponsible.

2. Adding additional lanes will only bottleneck the traffic at the Los Angeles County line; this message was clearly communicated during the early stages of the public meetings. Los Angeles County has not agreed to expand the 405 Freeway on their side of the border so truncating this at, Valley View Street, or any exit, will still create a bottleneck.

3. Creating a three or more person carpool lane is confusing and inconsistent with the remaining state of California. What happens when the vehicle carrying two passengers enters the short HOV lane from the Los Angeles County line or further south in Orange County? They exit the carpool lane?

I attended several of the previous public meetings. The public was clear - they are not in support of these measures. By "repackaging" these measures under a different name seems to me like it is being forced onto the taxpayers. My input is the same: **no on these measures.**

1

PC-N6

From: Phyllis Nordstrom [pnord@earthlink.net]
Sent: Friday, August 02, 2013 11:44 AM
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS
Subject: 405 SDEIR-DEIS Comment Period

Smita Deshpande, Brand Chief
Caltrans-District 12
"Attn: 405 SDEIR-DEIS Comment Period"
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92612

As a resident of College Park East I urge you to consider Seal Beach Alternate 1, no impact to the Almond Avenue sound wall. Thank you-Phyllis Nordstrom

1

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-N

Response to Comment Letter PC-N1

Comment PC-N1-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-N2

Comment PC-N2-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Selection.

Response to Comment Letter PC-N3

Comment PC-N3-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange.

Response to Comment Letter PC-N4

Comment PC-N4-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in

Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Selection, Noise/Noise Analysis, Air Quality, Northbound Braided Ramps at the Magnolia/Warner Interchange.

Response to Comment Letter PC-N5

Comment PC-N5-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. You will be notified when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Caltrans acknowledges your support for Alternative 1, adding one GP lane in each direction.

With respect to opposition to tolling, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling. With respect to project funding, please see Common Response – Measure M.

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles county line, please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line. With respect to truncating a northbound lane at the Valley View exit, please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall. With respect to the transition areas and potentially differing occupancy requirements for use of the HOV lane in Los Angeles County and free use of Express Lanes in Orange County, operations analysis of the transition areas are presented in the Draft EIR/EIS on pages 3.1.6-96 and 3.1.6-97. The transitions would be similar to those currently in operation on SR-91 at both the eastern and western ends of the existing Express Lanes.

Response to Comment Letter PC-N6

Comment PC-N6-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Almond Avenue Soundwall, Preferred Alternative Selection.